



IN THIS ISSUE

•••••

SEGAKWENG V OGILVY (JOHANNESBURG) (PTY) LTD: PRESCRIPTION: CERTAINTY BEFORE EQUITY

EMPLOYMENT

SEGAKWENG V OGILVY (JOHANNESBURG) (PTY) LTD: PRESCRIPTION: CERTAINTY BEFORE EQUITY

In Segakweng v Ogilvy (Johannesburg) (J2428/12) [2014] ZALCJHB 191 (29 May 2014) the Labour Court dismissed an application to make an arbitration award an order of court in terms of s158(1)(c) of the Labour Relations Act, No 66 of 1995 (LRA) on the basis that the award had prescribed.

Ms Segakweng, (applicant) had been dismissed from the employ of Ogilvy (Pty) Ltd (respondent) and had referred an unfair dismissal dispute to the Commission for Conciliation, Mediation and Arbitration (CCMA). The Commissioner found in favour of the applicant and awarded her R499,992.00. The respondent was ordered to pay this amount within seven days of receipt of the award, which was served on 9 August 2009. However, the respondent never complied with the award and instead, brought an application to review and set aside the award.

On 12 September 2012, the applicant brought an application to have the award made an order of court. The respondent opposed the application on the basis that the award had prescribed in terms of s11(d) of the Prescription Act, No 68 of 1969 (Prescription Act).

Application of the Prescription Act

Firstly, the court considered whether the Prescription Act applied to claims under the LRA. The court acknowledged case authority to the effect that where the LRA imposes a specific time limit on a claim, that limit will take precedence over the provisions of the Prescription Act. However, s158(1)(c) of the LRA does not stipulate any time limit for the enforceability of an arbitration award and consequently the court found that the Prescription Act applied.

Secondly, the court held that an application under s158(1)(c) of the LRA counts as a process whereby the creditor claims payment of a debt in terms of s15(1) of the Prescription Act and therefore interrupted the running of prescription in respect of the award in question. The court also noted that the same is not true of review applications.



FOLLOW US ON TWITTER: **@CDH LabourLaw** Thirdly, the court found that the applicable prescription period of three years commenced running on the date on which the debt became due, which was seven days after the date on which respondent received the award, being 16 August 2009. Consequently, the award had prescribed on 16 August 2012, almost one month before the respondent instituted the application, which was therefore too late to interrupt prescription.

Equity considerations

Despite the Labour Court's status as a court of equity, the court in casu firmly rejected the notion that the principle of equity required the preservation of the award:

"In the present context, considerations of fairness are however subject to the overriding objectives of certainty and finality in the relationship between employers and employees... ...as a general proposition, equity considerations do therefore not enter the deliberation when a Court applies the Prescription Act." Employers are advised that bringing a review application will not interrupt the running of prescription on an award. Furthermore, while this does not appear from the present case, employers are cautioned that even partial compliance with an award may be deemed a tacit acceptance of liability in terms of the award and will therefore interrupt prescription.

Lauren Salt and William Woolcott





CONTACT US For more information about our Employment practice and services, please contact:



Aadil Patel National Practice Head Director **T** +27 (0)11 562 1107 E aadil.patel@dlacdh.com



Johan Botes Director **T** +27 (0)11 562 1124 E johan.botes@dlacdh.com



Mohsing Chenig Director **T** +27 (0)11 562 1299 E mohsina.chenia@dlacdh.com



Fiona Leppan Director **T** +27 (0)11 562 1152 E fiona.leppan@dlacdh.com



Gillian Lumb Cape Town Regional Practice Head Director T +27 (0)21 481 6315 E gillian.lumb@dlacdh.com



Hugo Pienaar

Director **T** +27 (0)11 562 1350 E hugo.pienaar@dlacdh.com

Anli Bezuidenhout

Shungu Mariti Associate

Inez Moosa Associate

Associate

Lauren Salt

Associate

T +27 (0) 21 481 6351

T +27 (0)11 562 1475

T +27 (0)11 562 1420

T +27 (0)11 562 1119 E zinhle.ngwenya@dlacdh.com

T +27 (0)11 562 1378

E lauren.salt@dlacdh.com

Zinhle Ngwenya

E inez.moosa@dlacdh.com

E shungu.mariti@dlacdh.com

E anli.bezuidenhout@dlacdh.com

Associate





Director

Michael Yeates

Gavin Stansfield

T +27 (0)21 481 6314

E gavin.stansfield@dlacdh.com

- **T** +27 (0)11 562 1184
- E michael.yeates@dlacdh.com

Faan Coetzee

Executive Consultant T +27 (0)11 562 1600

Kirsten Caddy

Senior Associate **T** +27 (0)11 562 1412 E kirsten.caddy@dlacdh.com

Nicholas Preston Senior Associate

T +27 (0)11 562 1788 E nicholas.preston@dlacdh.com

Andrea Taylor Senior Associate T +27 (0)11 562 1687 E andrea.taylor@dlacdh.com

Ndumiso Zwane

Senior Associate

- **T** +27 (0)11 562 1231
- E ndumiso.zwane@dlacdh.com
- This information is published for general information purposes and is not intended to constitute legal advice. Specialist legal advice should always be sought in relation to any particular situation. Cliffe Dekker Hofmeyr will accept no responsibility for any actions taken or not taken on the basis of this publication.

BBBEE STATUS: LEVEL THREE CONTRIBUTOR

JOHANNESBURG

1 Protea Place Sandton Johannesburg 2196, Private Bag X40 Benmore 2010 South Africa Dx 154 Randburg and Dx 42 Johannesburg T +27 (0)11 562 1000 F +27 (0)11 562 1111 E jhb@dlacdh.com

CAPE TOWN

11 Buitengracht Street Cape Town 8001, PO Box 695 Cape Town 8000 South Africa Dx 5 Cape Town T +27 (0)21 481 6300 F +27 (0)21 481 6388 E ctn@dlacdh.com

www.cliffedekkerhofmeyr.com

©2014 May2014v2.F



E faan.coetzee@dlacdh.com